UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/022,443	12/20/2001	Randal L. Dunn	95-474	5112

23164 7590 06/06/2007

LEON R TURKEVICH
2000 M STREET NW
7TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 200363307

EXAMINER	
HAILE, FEBEN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/022,443	DUNN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Feben M. Haile	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 March 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-44* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,5-11,15-21,25-31 and 35-44* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *2-4,12-14,22-24 and 32-34* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In view of applicant's amendment filed March 14, 2007, the status of the application is still pending with respect to claims 1-44.

2. The amendment filed has been considered, however a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of previously cited references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 5-7, 11, 15-17, 21, 25-27, 31, 35-37, 41-44 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prasad et al. (US 2003/0016684), hereinafter referred to as Prasad, in view of Jeong (US 5912,628), hereinafter referred to as Jeong.

Regarding claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, Prasad discloses a routing table configured for storing message class entries identifying respective message classes, each message class entry specifying at least one destination link identifier for a corresponding destination link assigned to the corresponding message class **(figure 4 unit 210, figure 5, and page 3 paragraph 0033; a routing table stores point codes, i.e. routing codes, for specifying destination nodes and routing contexts)**; and a

processor configured for selecting one of the message class entries based on determining the corresponding identified message class matches the specific message class of the received signaling message, the one message class entry specifying the corresponding destination link identifier for the one destination link **(figure 4 unit 200 and page 3 paragraphs 0030-0031; a processor reviews the routing table to determine the routing context associated with the routing code and executes a transmission process accordingly)**. As the Examiner interprets the claims in their broadest sense, one could identify the "routing context" as the "message class" because both are used for the organization of the signaling messages into categories for treatment.

Prasad fails to explicitly suggest selecting one of the destination links based on the processor classifying the received signaling message as assigned to the corresponding message class based on prescribed message class selection criteria.

Jeong teaches a method of transmitting a signal message where a link for transmission is selected using a criterion that classifies the message into two types **(column 3 lines 12-17)**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of classifying a message for signal link selection taught by Jeong into the processor of the signal transfer point disclosed by Prasad. The motivation for such a modification is an improved method of selecting a link for the transmission of a signal message.

Regarding claims 5, 15, 25, and 35, Prasad discloses a plurality of linkset interfaces configured for receiving signaling messages from respective input linksets **(figure 2 links A, B, & C and figure 4 units 120, 130, & 140)**.

Jeong teaches the prescribed message class selection criteria including classifying the received signaling message based on identifying one of a plurality of input linksets having supplied the received signaling message **(column 3 lines 12-17; transmitting signal messages over links where a criterion classifies the links into two types, i.e. 0 or 1, where the signal message contains a SLS value equivalent to the binary code of the selected link and classifying the message as belonging to one of the links according to that value)**.

Regarding claims 6, 16, 26, and 36, Jeong discloses wherein the prescribed message class selection criteria include classifying the received signaling message based on prescribed user-selected selection criteria **(column 3 lines 12-17; transmitting a signal message where a link for transmission is selected using a criterion that classifies the message into two types)**.

Regarding claims 7, 17, 27, and 37, Jeong discloses wherein the user-selected selection criterion includes a user-selected data pattern **(column 3 lines 12-17; the criterion used for classifying a signal message is obtained by dividing a value contained in the signal message by two, wherein the value is the decimal equivalent of the binary code for the signal message)**.

Regarding claims 41-44, Jeong discloses wherein the classifying includes classifying the received signaling message independent of any information in the routing

table **(column 3 lines 12-17; the criterion used for classifying a signal message is obtained by dividing a value contained in the signal message by two, wherein the value is the decimal equivalent of the binary code for the signal message)**.

4. Claims 8, 18, 28 and 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prasad et al. (US 2003/0016684), hereinafter referred to as Prasad, in view of Jeong (US 5912,628), hereinafter referred to as Jeong, in view of Allison et al. (US 2004/0081206), hereinafter referred to as Allison.

Regarding claims 8, 18, 28, and 38, Prasad as modified by Jeong disclose the limitations of the base claims.

Prasad, Jeong, and/or their combination fail to explicitly suggest wherein the prescribed message class selection criteria include classifying the received signaling message based on a service indicator value from the received signaling message.

Allison teaches a signaling gateway routing node that includes a discrimination function that examines a service indicator parameter in the received message to determine the type of message **(page 4 column 0034)**.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of the discrimination function taught by Allison into the processor of the signal transfer point disclosed by Prasad as modified by the method of classifying a message for signal link selection taught by Jeong. The motivation for such a modification is an improved for service selection in a telecommunications signaling network.

5. Claims 9-10, 19-20, 29-30, and 39-40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prasad et al. (US 2003/0016684), hereinafter referred to as Prasad, in view of Jeong (US 5912,628), hereinafter referred to as Jeong, in view of Lee (US 2001/0008532), hereinafter referred to as Lee.

Regarding claims 9, 19, 29, and 39, Prasad as modified by Jeong disclose the limitations of the base claims.

Prasad, Jeong, and/or their combination fail to explicitly suggest wherein the prescribed message class selection criteria include classifying the received signaling message based on global title translation (GTT) parameters retrieved from the received signaling message.

Lee discloses a No. 7 gateway that provides global title translation services represented by unique numbers **(page 1 paragraph 0006)** where theses services are classified according to these values **(page 1 paragraph 0007)**.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of the No. 7 gateway taught by Lee into the processor of the signal transfer point disclosed by Prasad as modified by the method of classifying a message for signal link selection taught by Jeong. The motivation for such a modification is an improved method of a mapping function for different translation types in a No. 7 gateway signaling network.

Regarding claims 10, 20, 30, and 40, Lee discloses wherein the prescribed message class selection criteria include classifying the received message based on a Global Title Address (GTA) from the GTT parameters **(page paragraph 0006-0007;**

that unique numbers represent global title translation services for classification purposes). As the Examiner interprets the claims in their broadest sense, one could identify the "unique numbers" as the Global Title Address because both are used for the organization of the signaling messages into categories for treatment.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 2-4, 12-14, 22-24, and 32-34 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, see pages 12-19, filed March 14, 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 5-11, 15-21, 25-31, and 35-40 under 35 USC 103 (a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of new interpretations of previously cited references, specifically Jeong (US 5912,628).

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Feben M. Haile whose telephone number is (571) 272-3072. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00am - 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

05/25/2007

DORIS H. TO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600